WRITTEN DECISION
OF THE INTERNATIONAL
EXAMINATION AUTHORITY (SUPPLEMENTARY SHEET)

International file reference

10/568734

PCT/EP2004/051028

Re. Point V

1.   This decision makes reference to the following documents:

    D1: 'Profile of the Session Initiation Protocol and the
        Session Description Protocol for interworking between
        SIP/SDP and BICC/ISUP, XP002263261

    D2: 'BEARER INDEPENDENT CALL CONTROL CAPABILITY SET 2',
        XP001150671

2.   Regardless of the problems of clarity detailed below, the
      object of claim 1 is not based on an inventive step, Article
      33(3) PCT.

2.1. D1 discloses the following in relation to most of the
     features in claim 1:

     SIP protocol (chapter 2, reference No. 1), comprising at
     least one protocol element (page 6, lines 28-31) for display
     of a bearer modification ("re-INVITE", page 6, lines 37-39).

2.2. The object of claim 1 differs from the disclosure in D1 in
     the display of a cause of the bearer modification.

2.3. The objective technical problem which is to be resolved by
     the invention is the backwards compatibility of the SIP
     signaling for best possible support of telephony service
     features.

2.4. The display of causes is a normal technical measure, since
     it is an international standard in telecommunication
     networks. This measure is known for example from document D2
     (chapter 5 / clause 11.1.3). Taking this measure is
     suggested by the interworking with BICC required in D1 (page

1, lines 5-14) since the BICC standard already provides for the display of the causes.

3.   Regardless of the problems of clarity mentioned below, the object of the independent claims   and 10 is not based on an inventive step, Article 33(3) PCT.

3.1. The object of the method claim 7 corresponds completely with the non-inventive object claim 1.

3.2. Claim 9 contains a device which corresponds entirely with the non-inventive object of method claim 7.

3.3. The features of the device claim 10 correspond entirely with the non-inventive features of the device claim 9.

Re. Point VII

1.   The independent claims are not entered in the two-part form, Rule 6.3 (b) PCT.

2.   The features of the claims are not provided with reference symbols, Rule 6.2(b) PCT.

3.   The relevant prior art is not specified in the description, and D1 was not mentioned, Rule 5.1(a)(ii) PCT.

Re. Point VIII

1.1. Claim 1 claims protection for a "protocol", which represents neither a method nor a device. Therefore the category is unclear, Article 6 PCT.

1.2. This statement also applies to claims 2-6,

1.3. The formulation of the independent device claim 9 only

contains information about the result to be achieved
(execution of a method in accordance with claim 7), without
giving any device claims which lead to this result, Article
6 PCT.

1.4. This also applies to claim 10, because reference is made to
computer program products and undefined devices for
executing a method on undefined devices.

1.5. The expression "especially" in claims   is vague. It is
unclear whether the features following it should be part of
the scope of the patent or not, Article 6 PCT.